



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE IGUVINE TABLES

BY ROLAND G. KENT

1. The orthography of the Umbrian Tables of Iguvium is remarkably regular and consistent, if allowance be made for normal variations. Supposed irregularities, therefore, whether assigned to phonetic phenomena or attributed to the carelessness of the engraver, should be looked upon with suspicion. The point of view in the present studies is accordingly conservative; and the text is presented in exact transcription from the Tables. Even the dots of word division are given; where they are lacking in the original a hyphen is set before or after or between the words, to indicate the fact, and give a better control over the text.

2. For convenience, the following index of topics and words is presented, with references to the paragraphs in which they are discussed:

PHONOLOGY

- a/-u final: 11-17, esp. 13
- i i for ç š: 37-40
- r final: 23-26
- t final: 27-34
 - postvocalic: 28-30
 - after n: 31
 - after r: 32
 - after s: 33

WORD CONTAMINATION: 38, 42

WORDS AND PASSAGES

- arvia arviu I a 12, 16, 23: 11-12
- cehefi VI a 20: 41-42
- krematru II a 28: 16
- kukehes III 21: 41-42
- eruhu II b 22: 31
- erus: 44-50
- fefure II a 4: 31
- feia: 39

- habe I b 18, habe VI b 54: 18-23, 28
- hert IV 26: 28-30, 32
- iepru II a 32: 43-50, esp. 43, 50
- iuvesmik I a 31: 3-10, esp. 8
- panta: muta V b 2: 14-15
- peio-: 38
- pert II a 36: 32
- Petruniapert II a 35: 32
- pisher VI b 41: 32
- prosešeto: 49-50
- putrespe: erus IV 14: 44, note, 47, note
- staf/li I a 30-31: 3-10, esp. 9
- staheren I b 19: 31
- sururo VI b 48: 25-26, 31
- svepu I b 8: 17
- terti: erus: prusekatu II a 28: 47, 50
- triiuper trioper: 32
- usaie I b 45, usaçe II a 44: 40
- uou.se- VI b 11: 35-36

I. I a 30-31 **staf/li:iuvesmik**

3. A sacrifice to Tefer Jovius back of the Veian gate is being described: first three lambs are offered, then an animal cracker in the shape of a pig, then an animal cracker in the shape of a sheep. The text at this point reads:

30 **-api:eřel:purtius:enuk:suřum:pesuntrum:feitu:staf**

31 **li:iuvesmik:vestiçe:afiktu:**

"When you have laid this (on the altar), then offer a sheep cracker; pour a libation on it, .. "

4. **Eřel** is miswritten for **eřek**, but the real difficulty lies in **staf/li:iuvesmik**. In VI b, where the same ceremony is described in detail, we read of a *pesondro staflare* (written *pesondro.staflar.e.*) in 37, and the adjective recurs in 39 and 40. It has been recognized and accepted¹ that **suřum persuntrum** is at times a generic word for "animal cracker," whatever animal may be represented, and that even **suřum** alone may have this meaning. Therefore editors have been tempted to explain the puzzling words in one of several ways, as follows:

Bréal (*Tab. Eug.* [1875]) emends to **staflare esmik**.

Bücheler (*Umb.* 74 [1883]) changes the word divisions to **staflii uve^m esmik**, and translates *stabuli ovem, ei . . .*

Conway (*Ital. Dial.* [1897]) follows Bücheler, but translates *stabularem*; he would like to assume corruption and emend to **stafliari^m**.

Von Planta (*Gram. d. O.-U. Dial.* [1897]) would like to read **staflare esmik**.

Buck (*O. and U. Gram.* [1904]) emends to **staflii uve esmik**, and regards **staflii** as accusative singular of **staflīyo-*, the two words amounting to an adjective *ovillum* modifying **suřum pesuntrum**, though grammatically equivalent to *stabularem ovem*.²

5. Emendation to **staflare** may be cast aside at once, both because of the grammatical interpretation given by Buck, and because there is no other passage in the Iguvine Tables where such extensive miswriting is even suspected. Further, none of the other passages referring to the sheep cracker uses the actual word for sheep, which

¹ Buck, p. 305.

² *Ibid.*

editors see in the mysterious **iuvesmik**. Against Buck's interpretation, we may urge that in the wrong divisions of words in the Tables none separates a geminated character belonging to the same word, except where the postposition **e** is repeated after the locative (I b 27, II b 12, 27, 28).

6. To arrive at the correct explanation of the passage, I propose to set in parallel columns the passages about the two kinds of animal crackers, arranging the words by phrases:

I a 27-30

api:habina:purtius:

suřum:pesuntru/fetu:

esmik:vestiřam:preve:fiktu:

tefri:iuvi:fetu:

ukri/per-fisiu:tutaper:ikuvina:

testruku:peři:kapiře:peřum:

feit/u-

I a 30-32

-api:eřel:purtius:

enuk:suřum:pesuntrum:feitu:

staf/li: iuv-

-esmik:vestiřa:afiktu:

ukriper:fisiu-tutaper:ikuvinp/a:

feitu-

-nertruku:peři:kapiře:peřum:

feitu:

7. We must first correct two graphic errors: **eřel** is for **eřek**, one stroke being miswritten; and **ikuvinp/a** has a **p** which is merely a partly written **a**, for which there was insufficient room at the end of the line, so that the letter was repeated on the line below.

8. The two passages are quite parallel, consisting of short clauses, forming almost a jingle or doggerel, capable of easy oral transmission by the priests before they were reduced to writing. But the fourth clause of the prior passage, **tefri:iuvi:fetu**, is lacking in the second passage, except that the verb there appears at the end of the next clause; what then corresponds in it to the **tefri:iuvi** of the prior passage? I find this, somewhat obscured, in the **iuvesmik**, which stands for **iuv<i>esmik**, by simple omission of the **i** and the dots of separation, or for **iuv<ie>esmik**.¹ The latter is somewhat more probable, being simpler paleographically, for **iuv<ie>** is easily explained by haplography: in the Umbrian alphabet, **v** differed from **e** only in lacking the central cross-stroke, and the scribe, after engraving the **v**, might in referring to his model mistake the final **e** of the word for the **v** which he had just made, and pass on to the initial of the next word, with the common omission of the dots.

¹ Von Planta (II, 110) lists the examples of datives in **-ie** and **-i**, to *yo*-stems.

This involves a substantival use of the adjective *Jovius* to denote *Tefer Jovius*, but the word twice occurs as a substantive in II a 6-10, after mention of *Vesticius Sancius*, *Jupiter*, and *Spector*, which last name seems also to be but an epithet. Finally, the position of the dative at the end of its clause is not remarkable, since it occurs in that position after the verb **fetu** or **feitu** in I b 24, 28-9, 31, 43, and after the verb I a 8, 15, 20-21, 25, where **ukriper:fisiu:tutaper:Ikuvina** closes the clause. But the closest parallel is II a 7-9, which thus falls into clauses:

pune-purtiius: /
unu:suřu-pesutru:fetu:tikamne:iuvie:
kapiře:/peřu:preve-fetu:

9. **Staflī** should be interpreted without the attachment of the following letter, and if unchanged answers precisely to Buck's explanation as an accusative of **staflīyo-*. There is no Umbrian support for an ending in **-ii**; such forms are exclusively Oscan.¹ But there is an exact parallel in **terti tertim**.² Finally, **staflī** relates to the later derivative *staflare* (VI b 37, 40, -em 39) as **suřu** (in various forms; I a 27, 30, 33, II a 8, 9) does to the extension *sorsalem* (VI b 39, -ir 38),³ though *sorso-* also is found in the later document (6 times in VI b 24-38).

10. I therefore interpret I a 30-31 as follows:

-api:erek:purtiius:enuk:suřum:pesuntrum:feitu:staf/li:iuv <ie:>
esmik:vestiça:afiktu:

Ubi id porrexeris, tum figmentum facito ovillum Iovio, ei libamentum infigito . .

"When you have laid this (on the altar), then offer a sheep cracker to Jovius, on it pour a libation, . . "

II. **Arvia** AND **Arviu**

11. It is worth noting that in Tables I a 1 to I b 9, after which a new section begins, the word **arvia** occurs eight times (I a 3, 9, 12, 16, 23, 26; I b 3, 6), and is read **arviu** three times (I a 12, 16, 23) by von Planta and by Buck, while Conway reads **arvia** as a correction

¹ Von Planta, II, 134-37. *Sansii* is found (VII a 37) as a variant of **-ie**, **-i**, **-i**, or even **-e** (after **ç**), but is dative and not accusative.

² *Ibid.*, II, 142, where all the Umbrian forms are listed.

³ Cf. Buck, p. 305.

from **arviu** in the first of these (I a 12) and does not doubt the correctness of **arviu** in the other two.

12. If we examine Bréal's facsimiles of the Tables, we find that in all three of these there is a blurring of the surface, and are led to the idea that in all of them **arviu** has perhaps been first written and then more or less awkwardly changed to **arvia**. This interpretation is favored by the circumstance that in the same passage all other words ending in the \bar{a} which might appear in the Umbrian alphabet either as **a** or as **u**, are written with **a**, as follows: I a 4 **vatuva**;- 9 **supa**;- 13 **vatuva**;- 16 **supa**; 22 **vatuva**; I b 3 **vatuva**; 5 **vatuva**. The **vatuva**- of I a 13 has a similar suspicious blurring of the final letter. In the remainder of I b, every instance of final \bar{a} is written **u**. I therefore believe that we should read **arvia** in I a 12, 16, 23, and that the text of Table I is a copy of two documents of somewhat differing date.

13. In fact, a careful examination of the Tables written in the native alphabet shows that **a** and **u** were not used indiscriminately as finals, but that there was a pretty clear differentiation of the text into **a**-sections and **u**-sections, as follows:¹

I a 1 to I b 9 **a** is used to the exclusion of **u**.

I b 10 to end..... **u** is used to the exclusion of **a**.

II a 1 to 14 **u** is used to the exclusion of **a**.

II a 15 to end..... **a** is used chiefly, but **u** occurs in 28 and 34.

II b..... **u** is used exclusively.

III and IV **a** is used exclusively.

V a 1 to V b 7..... **u** is used chiefly, but **a** occurs in V b 2.

14. The passage in V b 2 is somewhat peculiar:

V a 29	enuk:fratru
b 1 ehvelklu:	feia:fratreks:
2 ute:kvestur:	panta:muta:
3 ařferture:si:	panta:muta:fratru:
4 atieřiu:mestru:	karu:pure:ulu:
5 benurent:ařferture:	eru:pepurkure
6 nt: herifi:etantu:	mutu:ařferture
7 si:	

"Then the Fratricus or the Quaestor shall take the vote of the Brothers how much fine shall be on the Flamen. As much fine as the majority of the Attidian Brothers who have assembled there, shall have demanded to be on the Flamen, so much fine shall be on the Flamen."

¹ Cf. von Planta, I, 79.

15. It is seen that the nominative **etantu mutu** in 6 accords with the use of **u** for final *-ā* in this section, while the accusative **panta muta** in 3 is normal for the ending with an implied final *-m*. The nominative **panta muta** in 2 does not follow the normal orthography of the passage. I venture to suggest that it is assimilated to the accusative **panta muta** of the next line, either graphically merely, or in actual syntax. Such irregularities of syntax in the relative are not infrequent; cf. Hor. *Serm.* i.6.14-15 *notante / iudice, quo nosti, populo,* for *quem*, with assimilation to the antecedent, and Verg. *Aen.* i.573 *urbem quam statuo vestra est*, where we expect either *urbs quam* or *quam urbem*. The assimilation of the relative to its antecedent is in Greek quite regular in some combinations,¹ even at times when the relative is subject in its clause, as in Thuc. vii.67.3 *βλάπτεσθαι ἀφ' ὧν ἡμῖν παρεσκεύασται*. Because of the irregular spelling of the ending of **panta muta**, therefore, I regard it as for **panta^m muta^m**, an abbreviated form of **muta^m**, **pantu mutu**, in which the first word is a pseudo-appositive of **ehvelklu**: "shall take the Brothers' vote, (namely) the fine, how much fine shall . . ."

16. One would hardly be warranted in making this suggestion, were it not that elsewhere in the Tables written in the native alphabet the two writings of the ending are not used indiscriminately—excepting always II *a* 28 and 34. The latter line cannot be doubted in any way; but the former is again peculiar. The word in 28 is **krematru**; it occurs as **krematra** in 23 and as **krematruf** in 26. The last two spellings are those normal here for the neuter plural accusative and the same with masculine ending² respectively; and if **krematru** stand for the masculine ending with omitted *f*, the form does not violate the orthographic style of the passage.

17. The lesson of this is that the normal orthography of the passage should be taken into account in the interpretation of disputed words which have **a** or **u** final or before an enclitic. For example, **svepu** I *b* 8 is probably not to be taken as meaning *si qua*, with nominative singular *qua*, as some have explained it.³

¹ Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*², §§1031-38.

² Buck, p. 119 and note.

³ Von Planta, II, 669.

III. I b 18 **svepis:habe**=VI b 54 *-sopir·habe*

18. In the lustration of the Iguvine people, one preliminary was the expulsion of the aliens. The later and fuller description in VI b 52-55 runs as follows: "When he has come to Acedonia, to the exits, then let them stop at the boundary. He who holds the ceremonial wand, shall set (them) out of bounds. Thus shall he set (them) out of bounds: 'Whoso is of the Tadinatè city, of the Tadinatè tribe, of the Tuscan, the Narcan, the Japudic name, let him go from amongst this people. If the going forth from amongst this people be not done, if anyone *habe*, take him to that place to which it is the law, do with him that which is the law.' Three times let him set (them) out of bounds."

19. The briefer account in I b 15-18 differs but slightly: "When you come to Acedonia, then you shall set out of bounds the Tadinatè city, the Tadinatè tribe, the Tuscan, the Narcan name, the Japudic name: 'If anyone **habe**, take him to that place to which it is the law, do with him that which is the law.' "

20. The question is on the meaning of *habe* in the two passages. It is normally taken to be a third singular present indicative active = Latin *habet*; this is understood in the intransitive sense "has property" = *possidet*, or "dwells" = *habitat*, by Aufrecht and Kirchhoff,¹ Bréal,² Brugmann,³ and von Planta,⁴ while Bücheler⁵ wavers between *siquis eiusmodi hic habitat* and *siquis id nomen habet*. Conway⁶ interprets "if anyone catches him," comparing *haburent* and *hatuto* in VII a 52, where there can be no doubt that the meaning is that of the Latin *capere*. Buck⁷ takes *habe* as meaning *restat* = "fails to withdraw beyond the ritual boundaries." Von Planta elsewhere⁸ suggests that *habe* may be the present participle = *habet est*, with graphic loss of the final *f* and omission of the auxiliary, but rejects

¹ *Die umbr. Sprachdenk.* (1851), II, 258.

² *Les tables eugubines* (1875), p. 178.

³ *Ber. d. sächs. Ges.* (1890), p. 230.

⁴ *Gram. d. O.-U. Dial.* (1897), II, 426.

⁵ *Umbrica* (1883), pp. 96-97.

⁶ *Ital. Dial.* (1897), II, 511, n. 2.

⁷ 279 (1904).

⁸ II, 289.

this as improbable. Inasmuch as the omission of final *t* is exceedingly rare in Umbrian, and the agreement in its omission in the two occurrences of *habe* is therefore noteworthy, Ebel¹ interprets *habe* as a third singular perfect subjunctive active on the proportion *habe*: **habust*=Osc. *hipid*:*hipust*; but this has not gained acceptance, and the problem of the meaning is not thereby solved.

21. There is an inherent improbability in the interpretation "if any one (of this classification) dwells (here)," since the warning is against staying within the limits during the ceremony, and not against having a residence there at other times. All the other interpretations, except Conway's, lack point. All, except Ebel's, imply the rare omission of final *t*.

22. An easy solution is to take *habe* as passive, with an implied *r*=Latin *capitur*. This eliminates the rare omission of final *t*, while final *r* in passive forms of verbs is more often omitted than written.² The passage, in the longer version, then means: "If the going forth from among this people be not done, if any one *be caught*, take him to that place to which it is the law, do with him that which is the law." The nature of this portentous penalty I have not the boldness to conjecture.³

IV. OMISSION OF FINAL *R*

23. Von Planta⁴ gives the data for the graphic omission of final *r*, and for its retention. To summarize, 19 verb forms omit the *r* and 6 retain it (I omit the doubtful interpretation **-ise-** I b 8); the postposition **-per** omits *r* 3 times in the Umbrian alphabet, and keeps it in 31 instances in the same alphabet and in all of the more than 100 instances in the Latin alphabet; nouns and adjectives always keep the *r*, 58 instances; the preposition **super** keeps the *r* in its two occurrences, while **anter** (once) and *ander* (twice), always with *r*, are probably the first elements of compounds, and not separate words.

¹ *KZ*, VI (1857), 420.

² On final *t*, von Planta, I, 573-76; Buck, pp. 80-81; on final *r*, von Planta, I, 568-69; Buck, p. 68.

³ Conway, II, 511, n. 2, remarks, "i.e. in poenam or 'extra urbem,'" but the former alternative does not define the penalty and the latter seems utterly inadequate.

⁴ I, 568-69.

To his verb list I may add **habe** I b 18, *habe* VI b 54, if they are to be interpreted as passives.¹

24. Von Planta suggests that the omission of the final *r* properly belonged to the position before certain consonants, notably before *s*, *f*, and possibly *d*. But an examination of the 24 instances of omission of final *r* entirely fails to support this, probable as it is inherently; and in actual practice the rule must be worded as follows, that final *r* may be omitted in writing before any initial letter, though analogy prevents this omission in case forms of nouns and adjectives (as von Planta says).

25. In view of this, I desire to present an argument for von Planta's suggestion² that *sururo* VI b 48 stands for **sururor* by dittography for the ordinary *surur* *suror*. We find not only these forms, but a form with the enclitic *-(h)ont*, written both *sururont* and *suront*, the latter being by haplogy for the longer form. Both are well attested, since *sururont* occurs 9 times and *suront* occurs 11 times. But it seems not to have been observed that, with one exception (VI b 39), *sururont* occurs only in VI b 48 to VII a 2, a separate section giving introductory material on the purification of the people. In the preceding and following sections of VI and VII we find *suront*, *surur*, *suror*. It is not then so astonishing to find *sururo* in the passage characterized by *sururont*, even though we admit *sururont* to be the original from which *suront* was made by haplogy, while *sururo* must be *sururo(r)* by dittography for *suror*. It seems almost too neat that *suror* and *suront* are both found in VI b 37, and that *sururo(r)* and *sururont* both stand in VI b 48.

26. The conclusion would be that in *sururo* there is the graphic omission of final *r*, with dittography of the *-ur-*, and not the rare omission of final *-nt*.

V. OMISSION OF FINAL *t*

27. In considering final *t* in Umbrian, four positions must be distinguished: after a vowel; after *n*; after *r*; after *s*.³

28. (1) The only generally accepted instances of loss of final *t* after a vowel are **habe** I b 18, *habe* VI b 54, **heri** IV 26. Of these,

¹ Cf. §§18-22, *supra*.

² I, 575.

³ Collation of examples in von Planta, I, 573-76.

the first two have been interpreted above as passive rather than active forms, and the omitted letter is *r*.¹ As for **heri**, in the clause **svepis: heri**, the correction of the text to **svepis: hert**² is easy, in view of the third singular present indicative active, which is variously written **herter herte herti hertei**, with syncope of the connecting vowel. Paleographically, we find three other instances where *t* has been converted into *i* by the failure of the engraver to make the slanting cross-stroke: **feiu** I b 25 and II b 26 = **fetu**, and **tuseiu** I b 40 = **tusetu**.

29. Further, the short table IV has an unusual number of graphic errors:³

- IV, 1 **aveitu** = **ařveitu** (the only instance of the omission of ř before a consonant other than **s**)
- 5 **erererunt** = **ererunt** (by dittography)
- 6 **ereçlamar** = **ereçlumar**
- 7 **iseçeles** = **iseçetes**
- 9 **sevakne** = **sevaknes** (space for the **s** is lacking at the edge of the Table)
- 12 **Pupřikes** = **Pupřiķe**
- 14 a verb is omitted after **erus**, or **erus** should be **eru**⁴
- 14 **purtupite** = **purtuvite**
- 17 **vesveça** = **vesteça**
- 18 **inuntek** = **inunek**
- 23 **inumk** = **inunek**
- 25 **persihmu** = **persnihmu**
- 26 **Puprçes** = **Pupřiçes** (no syncope in the other 8 instances)
- 28 **tertu** = **teřtu**
- 33 **neiřhabas** = **nei ařhabas** or **nei ařhabias** (probably real crasis; yet there is no other example of crasis in the Tables⁵)

30. For these reasons, it appears likely that we should read **habe^r habe^r hert** in the three words where loss of final *t* after a vowel has been accepted.

¹ Cf. §§18–22, *supra*.

² Cf. von Planta, I, 575, n. 5; II, 289.

³ Despite the fact that the word divisions in the interior of the lines are marked with the utmost care, there being only one omission (**triätefra** 2) and one extra division (**es.kamitu** 1, with a single dot instead of the double dots).

⁴ Cf. §47, note, *infra*.

⁵ Actual spoken crasis in **purtatulu** II b 18 and **nuřpener** V a 13 (Brugmann, *Ber. d. sächs. Ges.* [1890], p. 226) is unlikely.

31. (2) For loss of final *t* in the ending *-nt*, there are again just three examples which have been considered reasonably sure: **staheren** I *b* 19, **eruhu** II *b* 22, **sururo** VI *b* 48; to which **fefure**¹ II *a* 4 must be added. But the first two of these have already been explained by von Planta, on the ground that the following word began with *t*, which caused haplography: **staheren**: **termnesku**, **eruhu**: **tiçlu**, while the loss of the *n* in **eruhu** before the implied *t* is an omission very common in II *b*;² though in the third plural it is paralleled only by **furfaθ** I *b* 1. **Sururo** may well be **sururo**^r, dittographic from **suror**.³ **Fefure** is more troublesome; resemblance to VI *a* 26 has caused it to be taken from the root *fu-*. But the parallelism of the two passages is hardly close enough to be decisive; and as there is no Italic warrant for reduplication in the verb *fu-*, nor any warrant in Umbrian for the entire omission of the third plural *-nt* without some contributing factor, it is better to follow Bücheler,⁴ who takes the word as a third singular perfect indicative active, reduplicated, meaning approximately *turbavit*, comparing the Latin verbs *forare* and *furcellare*; the personal ending is then *-d*, which disappears in Umbrian. The subject **aiu** may be a feminine singular in *-ā*, or a feminine singular in *-ōf*⁵ (a remade form regular in *on-* stems with omission of the *f*, or a neuter singular in *-o(m)*; the agreement of **urtu** with this is obvious.

32. (3) Final *rt* in Umbrian is always of secondary origin, by the loss of a final short vowel, since unprotected final *t* became *d*; and in verbs the *-rt* has been the product of the syncope also of a vowel between the *r* and the *t*. In such a position the *t* was lost unless retained by analogy. **Pert** II *a* 36 'trans' keeps the *t* by association with *post*, but as an enclitic in multiplicatives loses the *t*: **triuper trioper**, while in **Petruniapert** II *a* 35 the enclitic is **per** 'pro' and has no warrant for the *t*, which is wrongly written by the influence of **pert** in the next line.⁶ **Hert** IV 26 (miswritten **heri**⁷) keeps the *t* by the influence of other third singulars with the primary ending, while **pisher** VI *b* 41, which in form is equal to Latin **quivult*

¹ Buck, p. 81.

² Von Planta, I, 575, n. 1.

³ Cf. §§25-26, *supra*.

⁴ Pp. 124-25.

⁵ Buck, p. 73.

⁶ Von Planta, I, 575.

⁷ Cf. §§28-30, *supra*.

and in meaning equals *quivis* or *quilibet*, follows normal phonetic development because of its dissociation from the paradigm.¹

33. (4) On final *st*, I have nothing to add to von Planta's discussion: that the *t* is unwritten in about one-tenth of the instances in verbs, and in *post* when the preposition is not separated from the noun which it governs.

34. *Conclusions*.—In Umbrian, final *t* is not lost after vowels, nor after *n*; it is lost after *r* unless retained by analogy; after *s* it may or may not be omitted, though it is normally written.

VI. VI b 11 *uou.se-* (= *uouse*)

35. The dative *uouse*, miswritten *uou.se-*, is apparently equal in meaning to Latin *voto*; but its phonetic history has not been satisfactorily explained. Von Planta² equates it with Latin **voviciō*, from **wog^whikyo-* > **woχwikyo-* > **woh^wkyo-* with syncope before the Oscan-Umbrian change of labio-velars to labials > **wo^hwkyo-* > **wowkyo-* > **vouçio-*, of which the dative singular in the Latin alphabet is *uouse*, with *s* for *š* and omission of the *i* (= *y*) after the palatalized consonant; the retention of the diphthong is due to its late origin. But we have here to assume a very early syncope, that the consonantal group may prevent the normal development of the labio-velar, and at the same time a late development of the diphthong, a combination which can hardly be maintained.

36. We should rather compare Umbrian **vufetes**, **vufru**, **Vufiune Uofione**, and admit a stage **vofikyo-*, whence syncope produced **vofkyo-* or **vofçyo-*, according to the relative chronology of syncope and assibilation. For the further development I would call attention to the successive stages **agetōd* > **aktōd* > **ahtōd* > **aitō(d)*, written **aitu** *aitu*. The point is that original *-kt-* gives *-ht-*, while *-kt-* arising by syncope gives *-it-*,³ with the voiced palatal spirant, and not the voiceless *h*. We might therefore expect secondary *-ft-* to differ in its product from original *-ft-* < *-pt-*, and to yield the voiced labial spirant. In other words, secondary *-ht-* is to its product *-it-* (= *yt-*), as secondary *-ft-* is to *-ut-*. It is a fair assumption, then, that before

¹ The *-her* is hardly a second person form as in Latin *quivis*, although von Planta (II, 44) seems to prefer this view.

² I, 451.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 356.

the *k* in **vofkyo-* (or **vofçyo-*) the development would be to **vouçyo-*, with the diphthong seen in *uouse*.

VII. THE SPIRANT IN **peiu peia** *peiu peia*

37. *K* in Umbrian before a palatal vowel or *y* became a sibilant designated by a special character in the Umbrian alphabet, transliterated **ç**, and by *š* or *s* in the Latin alphabet. But there are a few words which seem to have the spirant *i* (the regular development of *g* before palatal vowels or *y*) instead of *š*.¹

38. The most important of these is **peiu peia** *peiu peia*, an adjective applied to swine, and used as an alternative to **rufu rufra** *rofu rofa*. The latter unquestionably means 'red', and we must find a color designation in **peiu**. The simplest connection is with Latin *piceus*, through a form **pikyos*. This should give **piç(i)o-*, in which the first vowel might be written *e*; but we find *peio-*. I suggest that we have here an instance of word contamination, as in *alter* from **anteros* (represented in Sanskrit, Lithuanian, Gothic, and the modern Teutonic languages) and *alius*, and in the present *premo* from *pres-si* and **gemō* 'I press'.² **pikyos* was contaminated with **nigros* (Latin *niger*) and became **pigynos*, whence **piyo-* developed with perfect regularity. If **Peieriate** II *b* 4 is derived from this same stem,³ it furnishes no separate problem.

39. There is one other form in which apparently **ç** is replaced by **i**: the present subjunctive **feia** V *a* 23, V *b* 1, 'faciat,' a doublet of the regular **façia** II *a* 17. The latter manifestly has the vowel of Latin *faciō* and the former that of *fēcī*; and if we could assume an Italic stem without *k* for this verb in this meaning, the problem would be solved. But there is no such support in Italic, and the imperative **feitu** (20 times), **fetu** (47 times, one of which is mis-written **feiu**), **feitu** (3 times), **fetu** (52 times), **feetu** (once) points to a **fēkitōd*.⁴ We should therefore assume *fēk-* for some forms of the

¹ Buck, pp. 90-91; von Planta, I, 369-71.

² On this general theme, cf. H. Güntert, *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen*; for a special application, E. W. Fay, *CQ*, IX, 104-14; on *premo*, Brugmann, *IF*, XIII, 87.

³ Von Planta, I, 370.

⁴ Cf. Buck, p. 168; but von Planta, I, 358-59 (with bibliography), derives from *fē-* without the *k*.

present tense system, including *feia*. But the *i* for *ç* may be the product of analogy: *tertu* 'dato' is to *teřa* 'det,' as *habitu* 'habeto' is to *habia* 'habeat,' as *fertu fertu* 'ferato' is to **fera* (proved by passive *ferar*) 'ferat,' as *feitu* 'facito' is to *feia* 'faciat.'

40. The only other instance of *i* for *ç* is a graphic error, where the loop which differentiates *ç* from *i* is omitted: *usaie* I b 45, correctly written *-usaç-* II a 44.¹

VIII. III 21 **kukehes**: VI a 20 *cehefi*

41. There is no inclination to separate **kukehes** and *cehefi*, since both seem to concern the kindling of the fire; only, as Bücheler recognized,² **kukehes** has the prepositional prefix *com-*. **Kukehes** is in a clause introduced by *ap*, elsewhere spelled *ape api ape appei*, which regularly governs the future perfect, but in II b 28 governs the future *-purtuvies*; **kukehes**, not having the ending of the future perfect, must be the future. As to the value of the *-ehe-*, we should note that in the Umbrian alphabet length of the vowel was indicated only by the addition of the silent *h*; the doubling in II a 33-34 *a/anfetaf* and I b 20-21 *amprefu/us* is merely dittography induced by the division between the two lines,³ and the use of *-aha-* etc. is confined to the Latin alphabet. We must therefore assume a stem **kehe-** < **keghe-*.⁴

42. But this is not yielded directly by the ancestry of Latin *in-cendo*, nor by that of Greek *καίω κάω* < **kavyō*, despite Bücheler.⁵ We must again call to our aid contamination, by enlisting the root *dhegh-*, which appears in Sanskrit *dah* 'burn,' Gothic *dags* 'day,' etc. Thus we get a stem **keghe-* > *kehe-*, the future of which is regularly **ku-kehes**, and the perfect subjunctive third singular passive is *cehefi(r)*; but the *f*-perfect would seem to indicate a second conjugation verb rather than one of the third conjugation. The retention of *k c* before the palatal vowel is an archaism, possibly due to ritual use of the word.

¹ Buck, p. 91; von Planta, I, 371.

² P. 157.

³ Bücheler, p. 180.

⁴ Von Planta, I, 368-69.

⁵ Bücheler, p. 157.

IX. II a 32 *iepru*

43. In II a 32, we read *iepru:erus:mani:kuveitu*, which is interpreted, with omission of the difficult first word, "he shall gather up the *erus* with his hand." Bücheler takes *iepru* as *pro iis* = *ante ea*; but the omission of the *s* before the voiceless initial of the enclitic is without parallel, and *ie-* must represent *ye-* and not *iye-*, so that a pronominal form is unlikely. The latter objection holds against an interpretation as a dative or ablative or locative singular with post-positive *pro*.¹ Another explanation of *iepru*, as equal to Latin *jecur* in etymology and in meaning,² has been frowned on by Bréal and by von Planta.³

44. But it is quite impossible to come to a conclusion about *iepru* unless we have a definite notion of the meaning of *erus*. Buck⁴ says: "This denotes a supplementary offering by which the ceremony was completed. Sometimes it was used alone, sometimes with a Genitive designating the kind of offering to which it forms a complement." Thus we find *proseseto · erus* VI b 16 and 38, *hapinaru: erus* I a 33, *putrespe:erus*⁵ IV 14, *uestisiar · erus* VI b 16 and VII a 38, besides phrases in VI b 38 and 39 which deserve more detailed attention.

45. In VI b 38, after the giving of the *erus* of the *prosecta*, the *erus* of the pig-cracker libation is to be put into the trench at the right foot of the priest, then the *erus* of the sheep-cracker libation is to be put into the trench at his left foot.⁶ In view of the accusative *uestisiam · staflarem*, it is true, one might infer an identity of the sheep-cracker libation and the *erus*, and that the genitive in *uestisiar*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 201; Huschke, *Iguv. Tafeln*, p. 376; von Planta, I, 586, II, 214-15, 452; Buck, p. 337.

² Panzerbieter, *Quaestiones Umbricae* (Progr. Meiningen, 1851), p. 12 (not accessible to me); Savelsberg, *KZ*, XXI, 213.

³ Bréal, p. 287; von Planta, I, 334, 345.

⁴ Buck, pp. 304-5.

⁵ *Putrespe* = *utriusque*; apparently referring to the two deities just mentioned, and thus differing from all the other genitives used with *erus*. For a conjecture, see §47, note, *infra*.

⁶ That *erus* is a dative or accusative plural of a word meaning 'gods,' as some have maintained, can no longer be held (cf. von Planta, I, 587; II, 163), especially in view of II a 27-28, discussed in the text. The non-rhotacizing final *s* may represent a consonant group arising by syncope in, for example, **aisudhes* a neuter *-s*-stem; several other combinations are possible.

sorsalir was one of apposition; but such an interpretation involves reinterpreting *subotu* and *isec* in VI b 25, and it is easier to assume that the accusative is here written inadvertently for the genitive, the genitive having the meaning which Buck ascribes to it.

46. In its relation to the rest of the sentence, the *erus*, we find, is nearly always followed by a form of the verb 'to give': **titu, teřa, teřust, tetu, tertu, ditu, dirstu, dersa, dirstust**, with occasionally an intervening word describing the manner of presentation: **tačez** IV 27 'in silence,' **conegos** VI b 16 'kneeling'; the verb of giving is accidentally omitted at IV 14.¹ The other occurrences are all in the account of the dog sacrifice to Hontus Jovius, where **erus** is followed by **prusekatu, mani:kuveitu, kuveitu:teřtu** (II a 28, 32, 40). The *erus*, then, is something which may be cut off, gathered up with the hand, and given.

47. The most important passage in this connection is II a 27-28 **katles:tuva:tefra/terti:erus:prusekatu** "of the dog, cut off two pieces-for-burning, (and) a third (as) *erus*." The *erus* is then a portion of the victim, and may in view of its repeated association with the *proseřeto* or *prosecta* 'entrails' be considered a portion of the vitals of the victim. Further, the number of victims and the number of givings of the *erus* seem in a general way to correspond:

II a 91 giving of the <i>erus</i> ; victim, 1 ram
II a 28-401 giving of the <i>erus</i> ;* victim, 1 dog
II b 211 giving of the <i>erus</i> ; victim, 1 goat
IV 14 and 271 giving of the <i>erus</i> ;† victim, 1 sheep
VI b 162 givings of the <i>erus</i> ; victims, 3 sucking pigs
VI b 25-39=I a 333 givings of the <i>erus</i> ;‡ victims, 3 lambs
VII a 51 giving of the <i>erus</i> ; victims, 3 boars
VII a 381 giving of the <i>erus</i> ; victims, 3 sows
VII a 43-44=I b 34-363 givings of the <i>erus</i> ; victims, 3 heifers

* Unless **teřtu** is omitted in 32 after **kuveitu** by haplography.

† At IV 14 the verb is omitted after **putrespe erus**, and we can hardly count this as a certain example of giving of the *erus*. Could *erus* have been miswritten for *eru* by the influence of *-us-* in **pustin** in the preceding line, just above it, so that the sentence really means *tunc sacrarium unguito utriusque eorum* (namely, of Pomonus and of Vesona) ?

‡ Or four givings of the *erus* (VI a 25, 38, 38, 39); but in 25 *ditu* may mean merely 'lay down' or in 38 the *proseřeto erus* may not be a separate giving, but a summary explained by the next two givings.

¹ But cf. the second note following.

48. Possibly, where the number of victims exceeds the number of givings of the *erus*, the account of the ceremony does not include all the details, as is demonstrably the case with the older version of I a 33, when compared with the fuller description in VI b 37-42.

49. It is curious, too, that there is never any mention of giving or offering the *proseġeto*. Out of 17 passages mentioning them, there are 13 in which cakes or the like are added to them; in 2 (VI b 16 and 38), the *erus* of the *proseġeto* is to be given; in another (VI a 56), the *proseġeto* are to be proclaimed as fit for sacrificial use; in the remaining passage (II b 12), the *proseġeto* of the goat are to be laid on the fire, while later the *erus* is to be given (II b 21).

50. In view of these facts, and especially of the cutting off of the *erus* from the victim at II a 27-28, it seems likely that the *erus* was actually a part of the *proseġeto* or entrails (or may even be identical with them).¹ Therefore I hold that in II a 32 **iepru:erus: mani:kuveitu**, the word before **erus** denotes the portion of the entrails which is the *erus*. The word then can be none other than the Umbrian equivalent of Latin *jecur*, from **yeg^wr*. The Umbrian **iepor* has become either a neuter of the *o*-declension, or a masculine *r*-stem: **iepru** < **yep(o)ro(m)*. The sentence then means: "The liver, (which is) the *erus*, he shall gather up with his hand."

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

¹ It would explain why the *proseġeto* are never given if we should regard *proseseto* in the phrase *proseseto erus* not as a genitive plural, but as an accusative plural, with which *erus* is in apposition. This is in harmony with the similar relation in **iepru:erus**; it might explain, as syntactical attraction to the other phrase, the *uestisiam. staflarem* of VI b 38, where the genitive is expected (§45, *supra*). If this be correct, then the *proseġeto* when actually offered were called the *erus*, and the roasted *proseġeto* of II b 12 become the *erus* given at II b 21.